



Hierarchical Segmentation of Remotely Sensed Imagery Data using Massively Parallel GNU-LINUX Software

> James C. Tilton NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center Mail Code 935 Greenbelt, MD 20771 USA Telephone: (301) 286-9510 E-Mail: James.C.Tilton@nasa.gov

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.















Approach	Difficulty with the Approach
Spectral Feature Clustering	Spatial Information not Utilized
Edge Detection	No Guarantee of Closed Connected Regions
Region Growing	Process is Computationally Intensive and Global Convergence is Difficult











 $P(X_i)$ is a logical predicate that assigns the value TRUE or FALSE to X_i , depending on the image data values in X_i .

For example, let $P(\mathbf{X}_i) = \left(\frac{\left\|\mathbf{x}_j - \overline{\mathbf{x}}_i\right\|_2}{B} \le T \forall \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbf{X}_i\right),$

where *B* is the number of spectral bands, $\overline{x_i}$ is the mean vector for region *i*, x_j is a pixel vector in region *i*, and *T* is a threshold.

Call this the "classical" definition of image segmentation by region growing.

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.







Example : A 512x512 pixel section of Landsat ETM+ data obtained on May 28, 1999 over Washington, DC, U.S.A.

"Classical" region growing with logical predicate based on the vector 2-norm with T = 0.350.

Produced 4366 regions with global dissimilarity criterion value = 0.1304. (Took 4 minutes on a 1.2 GHz computer.)

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.











Example: A 512x512 pixel section of Landsat ETM+ data Obtained on May 28, 1999 over Washington, DC, U.S.A.

"Classical" region growing with cost function based on the vector 2-norm with T = 0.310.

Produced 4262 regions with global dissimilarity criterion value = 0.1088. (Took 4 seconds on a 1.2 GHz computer.)

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.











Image Segmentation Overview (cont'd)

References:

J.-M. Beaulieu and M. Goldberg, "Hierarchy in picture segmentation: A stepwise optimization approach," *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 150-163, Feb. 1989.

J. C. Tilton and S. C. Cox, "Segmentation of remotely sensed data using parallel region growing," *Digest of the 1983 International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*, San Francisco, Ca, pp. 9.1-9.6, August 31 – September 2, 1983.

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.





For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.

23

For the two products of the same cost function introduced earlier in the discussion of the optimum image segmentation of the optimum image segmentation. $F(X_{N-1} \cup X_N) \leq G(X_i \cup X_j) \text{ for all } i \neq j \text{ where } X_{N-1} \text{ and } X_N$ $F(X_{N-1} \cup X_N) \leq G(X_i \cup X_j) \text{ for all } i \neq j \text{ where } X_{N-1} \text{ and } X_N$ $F(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{N-1})$ $F(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N) = X_N$





Example: A 512x512 pixel section of Landsat ETM+ data obtained on May 28, 1999 over Washington, DC, U.S.A.

With convergence set at 4096 regions, HSWO produced a global dissimilarity criterion value = 0.0865. (Took 23 minutes on a 16 CPU Beowulf cluster.)

With convergence set at 1024 regions, HSWO produced a global dissimilarity criterion value = 0.1081. (Took 2 minutes on a 64 CPU Beowulf cluster.)

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.











Hierarchical Segmentation (HSEG)

Addition of option for merging spatially non-adjacent regions:

The HSEG algorithm optionally alternates merging spatially adjacent regions with the merging of spatially non-adjacent regions. The merging threshold for the spatially non-adjacent merges is set equal to the dissimilarity of the previous spatially adjacent merge, time a weighting factor (*spclust_wght* \leq 1).

With *spclust_wght* = 0.9 and convergence set at 64 regions, HSEG produced a global dissimilarity criterion value = 0.0741. (Took 45 seconds on a 64 CPU Beowulf cluster.)

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.











Hierarchical Segmentation (cont'd)

For example, let $G_{global}(X) = \frac{1}{N} \left[\sum_{X_i ln X} \left(\sum_{x_j \in X_i} \left\| x_j - \overline{x}_i \right\|_2 \right) \right],$

where n_i is the number of pixels in region i, $\overline{x_i}$ is the mean vector for region i, and N is the total number of pixels in the image.

In HSEG, the segmentation result at iteration *i*-1 is saved as a hierarchical segmentation output when

$$\frac{G_{global}^{i}}{G_{global}^{i-1}} > threshold.$$

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.

Image: constraint of the section of Landsat ETM+ data obtained on May 28, 1999 over Washington, DC, U.S.A.
Parameters: spclust_wght = 0.9, spatial_wght =1.0, min_nregions = 256, chk_nregions = 64.
Produced 15 hierarchical segmentation levels in 2 minutes and 33 seconds on a 64 CPU 1.2 GHz clock Beowulf Cluster.

























Region Labeling Tool Example

A 1024x1024 pixel section of Landsat ETM+ data obtained on May 28, 1999 over Washington, DC, U.S.A.

Parameters: *spclust_wght* = 0.9, *spatial_wght* =1.0, *min_nregions* = 256, *chk_nregions* = 64.

Produced 15 hierarchical segmentation levels in 2 minutes and 33 seconds on a 64 CPU 1.2 GHz clock Beowulf Cluster.

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.











Hierarchical Segmentation (cont'd)

HSWO is computationally intensive and HSEG with non-adjacent region merging is even more computationally intensive (due a combinatorial explosion of required comparisons between regions).

The computational problem is solved through a recursive formulation of the HSEG algorithm. (Reduced by being able to deal with fewer regions from smaller image sections *and* joining disjoint regions.)

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.

<image><image><section-header><text><text><text><text><text>



For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.





Recursive Hierarchical Segmentation (RHSEG)



In the initial stages of this project, a flaw was discovered in the current implementation of RHSEG:

Processing window artifacts often appeared in the results when RHSEG was applied to large images.

An example of this can be seen in the results from processing a Landsat ETM+ image obtained on May 28, 1999 covering an area south of Cambridge, MD.

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.















Recursive Hierarchical Segmentation (RHSEG)

The method is described in "A Method for Recursive Hierarchical Segmentation which Eliminates Processing Window Artifacts," NASA Case Number GSC 14,681-1 (patent application in process).

With this artifact elimination, RHSEG can now reliably produce artifact free results for large images in acceptable processing times.

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.





Parallel Implementation of RHSEG



61

The recursive form of RHSEG lends itself to parallelization.

The number of parallel processes that can be utilized depends on the depth of recursion. If 32x32 pixels sections are processed at the deepest level of recursion:

rnb_levels	image size	# of sections	# of CPUs
1	32x32	1	1
2	64x64	4	4
3	128x128	16	16
4	256x256	64	64
5	512x512	256	64 to 256
6	1024x1024	1024	64, 256 or 1024
7	2048x2048	4096	64, 256, 1024 or 4096

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.

Parallel Implementation of RHSEG

Processing times for 6-band Landsat ETM+ data. The 64 CPU results are from the Medusa Beowulf cluster and The 128 CPU results are from the Thunderhead Beowulf cluster.

rnb_levels	image size	# of CPUs	Processing Time
7	2048x2048	64	12 minutes, 24 secs.
7	2048x2048	256	2 minutes, 31 secs.
8	4096x4096	64	26 minutes, 22 secs.
8	4096x4096	256	8 minutes, 58 secs.
9	6912x6528	64	57 minutes, 27 secs.
9	6912x6528	256	memory limitation

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.



Analysis of MODIS Images of the Iberian Peninsula



63

With the help of my colleagues Patrick Coronado and Alan Lunsford I obtained MODIS data from August 4, 2003 from over

the Iberian Peninsula.

Drs. Martinez and Plaza had suggested this dataset would be of interest to conference attendees, because it shows wildfires that plagued this area last summer.

Processed a 3072x4096 section of the 250m data (took 25 minutes on Thunderhead), and processed a 1536x2048 section of the 500m data (took $3\frac{1}{2}$ minutes).

I will now explore the results from the 500m data using the Region Labeling Tool.

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.

<image><image><section-header><section-header><section-header><form><form><form>





Contact Information

James C. Tilton NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center Mail Code 935 Greenbelt, MD 20771 USA Telephone: (301) 286-9510 E-Mail: James.C.Tilton@nasa.gov URL: http://code935.gsfc.nasa.gov/code935/tilton

For Presentation to the Spanish Remote Sensing Conference, Sept. 18, 2003.